UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Liquidating World Depression

by

Salmon O. Levinson

VOLUME CXV NUMBER 2

Chicago, March 18, 1935

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Bi-Weekly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter November 15, 1933, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 23
The New Day Is Dawning!—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 25
Jottings.—J. H. H 26
ARTICLES—
Minority and Majority—*L. H. Robbins* 23
Liquidating World Depression—SALMON O. LEVINSON 27
British Rearmament Policy for "Imperial" Defense—(MRS.) MAYADEVI GANGULEE 31
Boy Lost!—JAMES A. FAIRLEY 33
Some Men Worth Knowing. 1. Frederick W. Shorter of Seattle —SYDNEY STRONG 34
TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—
Conundrum—BERTHA WILLIAMS 35
And Youth Has Seen—PENELOPE HARRIS 35
Help the Blind—JACK GREENBERG 35
Prayer from a Texas Hilltop—RALPH CHEYNEY 35
Peace Is Here—RAYMOND KRESENSKY 35
THE STUDY TABLE—
The Story of a Campaign—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 36
A Renaissance Sage—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 37
CORRESPONDENCE—
Important—National Religion and Labor Foundation 38
Quick, Beneficial Returns—WINIFRED B. COSSETTE 38
Capital Punishment—ANNIE E. GRAY 38
The Gold Clause—S. O. SANDERSON 38
THE FIELD—
Why I Don't Go to Europe This Year—*William J. Robinson* .. 22
Plan to Enslave India—*Reginald Reynolds* 39
35,000 Dead,—And the Driver Who Drinks—*The Signal Press* 40

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Why I Don't Go to Europe This Year

Briefly, because from the very entrance of the Mediterranean, from the Pillars of Hercules to the Baltic, Europe is one enormous hell.

Spain has crushed its republicans, liberals and workers with a ferocity reminding one of its great institution, the Spanish Inquisition. Italy is Mussolinized. About Germany, nothing need be said. It is the lowest of all hells. Austria is practically as bad. There is very little difference between Austrian Fascism and Germany's Nazism. Practically every other European country, Poland, Hungary, Greece, Roumania, Bulgaria and Jugo-Slavia, are ruled by cruel and ignorant dictators, and are nothing but hells on a smaller scale. In none of the countries mentioned can a person—a resident or a visitor—say anything without having to look behind his shoulder to see if some spy is not listening and watching.

In central Europe there are but two countries which are yet fairly decent, namely, Switzerland and Czecho-Slovakia. But Switzerland, formerly the playground of Europe, is now not only dead but reactionary. In the League of Nations, Switzerland's President was the only one who objected to the admission of Soviet Russia to the League. As to Czecho-Slovakia, that country which I visited several times, never, had any attraction for me.

Yes, we have France, but, while I have lived in France for several years and have visited it a number of times, it has lost all glamor for me. Its newspapers are the worst in the world, not only the most corrupt but the stupidest and emptiest, while the Fascists in various forms —the *Camelots du Roi, Les Jeunesses Patriotes, La Croix du Feu*— are spreading rapidly and their parades and marches have always sickened me. And as far as the climate is concerned, there is only one small spot in France, the Riviera, which is also greatly overrated, and does not compare with our Florida.

Here you have all central Europe.

We have Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries (including Finland) left. They are still the most decent countries in Europe. There

(*Continued on page* 39)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXV MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1935 Number 2

MINORITY AND MAJORITY

How a minority,
Reaching majority,
Seizing authority,
Hates a minority!

—*L. H. Robbins.*

In the clash and clamor of contending classes, amid the wild appeals of violence and the abandonment of all reasonable persuasion, these stormy days, we find ourselves thinking again and yet again of Lincoln's question *"Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people?"* This was the wisest word spoken in our country in the nineteenth century—at least, we know none wiser!—and we wonder why it is not as wise today as ever. Look at the words of that noble challenge. *"Patient!"*—is not patience still a virtue, or have we come to a period when time can no longer be spared for processes of thought and disciplines of spirit? *"Confidence!"*—confidence in the essential integrity of reality, especially as manifest in the hearts of humankind! Can we no longer have this confidence in men; and, if not, how can we trust ourselves and the rash remedies we propose for the cure of all our ills? *"Ultimate!"*—which means the last far goal, the fulfilment of our dreams, the attainment of our ends! By what right do we think that we can shorten the pathway to that remotest goal, least of all by the eruptive and destructive resort to violence? Do we travel a road faster and surer by blowing it up? *"Justice!"*—the slow balance of the right, the inexorable gravitation of the true. The meteor flames in one wild burst of splendor, and then goes out in darkness; but the planet, moving steadfastly within its appointed orbit, shines ever brighter to the coming day. "The arc of the moral universe is long," said Theodore Parker, whose teachings touched Lincoln's mind, "but it bends toward justice." And, lastly, *"the people!"*—the people in their highest, not lowest estate, as men and not as animals, creatures of reason and not mad brutes! If we cannot trust in these, how can we escape return to the jungle, for which violence in any form is only the perfect preparation? "A patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people! *Is there any better or equal hope in the world,"* asked Lincoln. We think not! We refuse to believe that we can use the weapons which destroyed yesterday to build tomorrow. What has happened since 1914 is retrogression. We would make good this retrogression, recover the democracy of Lincoln, and use this as the tool to rear our "golden city."

As we see the unspeakable Mussolini marshalling his armies, to crush with machine-guns and bombing-planes the helpless defenders of Abyssinia, we could wish that by some miracle the Ethiopian hosts might rise up and smite the Italian *Duce* to the dust. We can think of no living mortal whom we would so like to see overwhelmed with defeat and shame. An African victory like that of the Mahdi over Britain years ago—*that* would be worth seeing! But no sooner do we feel this wish than we recall that Mussolini himself would not suffer from this first blow. He will drop beneath no Ethiopian's spear, and shed no drop of blood upon the Abyssinian sands. No, like all proud commanders of this later day, the Italian dictator will stay safe and sound at home, and send thousands of heedless boys, innocent of evil and ignorant of the fell purposes of government, to do his dying for him. It is these who will fall before an Abyssinian onslaught, while mothers, as innocent and ignorant as their sons, mourn what the *Duce* has ravished from them. And not only these Italian youths, but thousands of these dusky African warriors as well! How they will be mowed down, like grass-blades beneath the sickle—and their village homes blown into atoms for another Roman holiday! It is vile business, this Abyssinian war. It is imperialism at its worst—a great and so-called civilized nation going forth upon an expedition of lust and loot, while accessories before the fact (England and France) applaud. And it is these countries which talk about peace, and offer pacts of disarmament and mutual defense! Bah! Let us spit this vile taste from out our month. We are sick from the hypocrisy of it all. Even the League of Nations fails us. There it sits as silent as a clan, as inert as a barnacle, while one of its greatest powers deliberately manufactures a war of destruction against one of its own fellow-members at Geneva. For never forget that Abyssinia, equally with Italy, is a member of the League! But nothing counts when markets, colonies, military glory are to the fore. It's the same old world as existed before the War. If the Abyssinian episode is any sign, this world is driving to the same old doom. Who can deny it? And who will not mourn it?

It is curious that better times (so-called) in England should be accompanied by the most bitter and determined uprising of the working class against the government that Britain has experienced in many years. Curious, that is, until the facts are known! These facts are that recovery in England, like recovery here in this country, such as it is, has brought no whit of improvement to the common people. There has been livelier business, increased foreign trade, some pick-up in employment, but the aggregate of unemployment remains as great as ever, the burden of relief is heavier, and general social misery spreads like a vast sea of death. For all the prosperity, if it may be called such, is expressing itself in profits, not in wages or purchasing power. The "haves" in other words, are getting some more, and the "have-nots," as usual, are getting nothing. Hence the popular wrath against a government which would cut down relief under the specious pretext that slightly better trade statistics mean anything to the great masses of the people! What is true in England is equally true of this country. Business is somewhat better today than it was a year ago—as witness the fact that 1934 produced no less than twenty-three new millionaires. Think of *that!* But wages are going down, prices are going up, unemployment is more dreadful than ever, and increasing relief threatens to bankrupt the state. All of which means that, in this country as in England, there has been no real solution of the problem of a disintegrating capitalism which steadily widens the gulf between wealth and poverty into which we may all sooner or later tumble! Recovery, in so far as it comes at all, comes only in terms of a fake prosperity which means nothing more than another orgy of speculation, exploitation, and demoralization generally. Every attempt to make our existing economic system work in furtherance of the public welfare has failed. The New Deal has done nothing except to pour out money for the profiteers to gamble with. It's all a mess, not to be handled except by those who would really establish a commonwealth.

An administration which juggles the currency may be expected, perhaps, to juggle figures as well. For a long time, now, recovery has been demonstrated by Washington by the simple process of declaring that the accepted unemployment figures are too high. It just isn't true, asseverates the President, that there are over 11,000,000 unemployed workers in the country today as indicated by all available and trustworthy statistics, and so he arbitrarily cuts down the total and boasts that the New Deal has put 4,000,000 men to work. But evidently this juggling act has not proved any too successful, especially when set against the increasing relief rolls which can't be dodged since they are measured by money actually paid out by the Treasury. For now the President has resorted to a more desperate expedient to prove his case. Thus, in his message to Congress calling for the extension of the NRA for another two years, Mr. Roosevelt dilated upon the marvelous achievements of this legislation, and among other things said:

> It is now clear that in the spring and summer of 1933 many estimates of unemployment in the United States were far too low and we are therefore apt to forget today that the national industrial recovery act was the biggest factor in giving re-employment to approximately 4,000,000 people.

So!—the unemployment estimates are now too high, and in 1933 they were "far too low!" Well, well—this reminds us of old school days, when our arithmetic text-book used to have an appendix of "answers to problems" in the back. In doing our "problems," we boys used to start with the "answers," and then work our figures accordingly. This is evidently the Roosevelt policy. The President starts out with the fact that he's got to have 4,000,000 people put to work by the NRA. To get this total, in defiance of all available statistics, he can cut down the unemployment figures for today, or he can raise them for yesterday. And, to make sure of his desired result, he does *both!* It is to be said that we boys in school never falsified figures—our work was honest work, directed however to an end set down in the beginning. But Mr. Roosevelt—well, he is not the first man, nor will he be the last, to juggle figures to serve his purpose!

The New York *Times* is worried because wages are so high. They are "too high in the interests of the workers themselves!" It really is difficult to understand how wages can be "too high" for those who have to spend them for the support of their wives and families, especially in these days of steadily rising prices. But the *Times* has it all doped out in terms of unemployment. There are 11,329,000 unemployed in this country today, a figure larger than that of a year ago at this time. "This appalling body of unemployed," says the *Times,* "is in large part the result of a prevailing wage level so high that industry has been unable to absorb more than 75 per cent of the workers at that figure. If wage rates were not quite so high, a much larger number of men would now be employed." In other words, it is for the good of labor as a whole for wages to come down. In still other words—to get right down to brass tacks, and say what is really meant here!—labor ought to bear the burden of unemployment. How to keep these unemployed alive? Why, obviously, by making labor support them out of their wages under guise of increased employment. It might be thought that capital has some responsibility here. Why is it not reasonable to argue, in the exact words of the *Times,* that "if (profits) were not quite so high, a much larger number of men would now be employed?" But no! We don't do things this way. If we need to spread the burden of unemployment, we put it on the backs of those who are working the hardest for the least return. If we have to have more

taxes, we soak the multitudes who are least able to pay. Share the wealth? No, share the poverty! Take from those who have a little the little they already have, and give it to those who have nothing, and then those who have more than they know what to do with will not be touched. It's a great game, as we have said before, and it always seems to work. But some day there will come a change; and no wages will be too high, since all wages will be the measure of the wealth produced, and used by the producers.

That taxation is bound to be enormously increased in city, state, and nation is one of the certainties of the near future. "As sure as death and taxes" is an old saying—and taxes look a good deal surer to us these days than death. This situation makes important the question as to where and how taxation shall be imposed. The usual principle involved is that of a "broad spread" of taxation—widening the base of application so that all the people will be gathered in. It's a good thing, we are told, to have everybody pay taxes, as this quickens a sense of public responsibility in many minds. So we are favored with low income taxes, sales taxes, movie taxes, taxation on subway and street-car fares, etc. But if there is anything more unjust than this method of levying taxes over a broad base, we should like to know what it is. Wealth is not widely distributed, so why should the government's levy upon wealth be widely distributed? If everybody had an equitable share in the country's productive income, then we should say that everybody should pay an equitable share of the nation's expenditure. But when 10 per cent of the population have the riches, and the rest hardly more than enough to live on, or perhaps much less, we call it a crime to tax sales, or rents, or fares, or anything else that comes out of the pockets of all the people. No, in our present society, with our present extravagantly unfair distribution of wealth, we contend that taxes should be imposed upon those who have the money wherewith to pay. Inheritance taxes—these first of all, and much heavier than any ever levied in this country; gift, or transfer, taxes—to prevent evasion of inheritance taxes, if nothing more; income taxes—raised to sixty, seventy, and eighty per cent in the upper brackets, and lifted altogether from the lower brackets; big-salary taxes—a 50 percent tax, or more, on salaries over $50,000; luxury taxes; public utility corporation taxes; stock-and-bond taxes; bank surplus taxes; excise taxes—etc., etc. The effective way to get money is to go where money is. And the just way, too!

Alyce Jane McHenry was an appealing case. This attractive 10-year old girl, it will be remembered, had an interior which was all upset. Nothing was in the right place. Her abdomen was empty of its accustomed organs which, through some freak of biological mischance, had all pushed up through the diaphragm into the chest. The stomach, for example, was under the left shoulder blade, and was in an upside down position. Less than two feet of the intestines were where they should have been—all the rest of the long coil was wrapped around the lungs and like a serpent was squeezing them to death. The heart was so pressed upon it could hardly beat. The whole organism was ceasing to function. Little Alyce was dying because she could not breathe, could not digest food, could not even drink. Then came along the great surgeon with his knife, to cut open the poor disordered body, and set its organs right. All of which we take to be a parable of our nation! America also is an organism—a political and economic organism—and everything is wrong. No organ is doing what it ought to do. The processes of life are no longer functioning. Air is all around us, but, like Alyce, we are gasping for breath. Food in abundance is right at hand, but, like Alyce, we cannot eat it and so have to destroy it. The heart is strong enough, but it cannot beat and thus pumps no blood into the channels of circulation. Everything in the interior of this country's life, as in Alyce's abdomen, is in disorder—upside down, out of place, tangled up, and death thus not so far away. What we need, if we are to survive, is the social surgeon. His knife of reform is not a pleasant instrument. The shock of the legislative operation is going to be dreadful. It may hazard our very life, as the physical operation hazarded Alyce's life. But poulticing and dieting and massage are going to do no good, as two years of such treatment under Dr. Roosevelt have conclusively shown. What we have got to do is to cut the nation's body right open, and with hands as gentle but as firm as Dr. Truesdale's when he put Alyce's organs into order, establish a system which will function in terms of justice. Alyce's mother, and the little girl herself, did not flinch from the operating table. When are we going to be as brave, and also intelligent, in our national affairs?

The New Day Is Dawning!

Poets reflect the spirit of their day. Homer immortalized the heroic age of Greek history. The Hebrew psalmists were seers, and sang the Hebrew spirit into the world even more effectually than Hebrew prophets shouted it.

Shakespeare is a poet of every land and of every era, to be sure, but only the Elizabethan age of England could have produced him. Tennyson and Browning are the true princes of the Victorian era. Nobody knows the spirit of Victorianism who does not know

them. The two are very different in temperament and even in their outlook on life, but between them they compass the complex spirit of the Victorian age.

Our American Longfellow was more than a Harvard professor. He was the fine old New England stoicism and conquering prowess spreading through the national life, and carrying it out and on through the nineteenth century.

For the last two or three decades American poetry has been voluminous beyond all precedent in our history. Verse appears in every magazine, and numerous periodical publications are devoted exclusively to it. Literature departments in the colleges and universities, and even in the high schools, have cultivated poetic expression as a daily exercise among thousands of students. Several writers live by their poetry while many more at least live in theirs.

And as art, much of our recent poetry has been charming. Word-painting has not often before attained such exquisite beauty. Nor has there lacked variety in form. There have been times when sloppy free verse and bizarre combinations of metre seemed to threaten a general prostitution of the poet's mission. But the poetic fraternity have faithfully called themselves back to devotion to the canons of real art again and again.

And poetic substance? Ah, there the deficiency has been marked during the past quarter of a century. Social passion has been lacking and social vision even more so. Vast volumes of recent American poetry are highly introspective. Poets have been much more deeply interested in what is going on inside of them than in the mighty movements forging through the world about them.

Every poet is sensitive, else he would not be a poet. Some of the greatest of them have been sensitive to the point of neurasthenia if not to that of positive neurosis. But no great poet can be content with analyzing his own inner states. His own sensitiveness gives him sympathies which more placid natures do not feel, but if he exhausts his feelings upon himself, and never has done with analyzing the quirks and turns of his own psychology, he is simply a bore, however artful may be his word-painting.

The social passion in the American poetry of the first few years of the present century was raw and rude, but there was much of it there. Social vision was not very refined, but there were attempts to interpret our national mission, at least our national urges. Even that has been lacking in most of the latest poetry.

Now, keen observers believe that a turn has come. The youngster Paul Engle is hailed as the clearest evidence of the new day. He is only a youngster, indeed. Still a student, a Rhodes scholar, now in Oxford. But the stuff is there, magnificent stuff, thoughtful American laymen and many of his fellow-poets believe.

One of the broadcasting companies had him on the air from London last Sunday. He is growing, and running true to the spendid promise in his prize poem at the Chicago Century of Progress Exposition, and in the first volume of his verse which appeared last summer. In his radio address on Sunday he announced a new volume, the second in the trilogy of which his "American Song" was the first.

The emergence of Paul Engle is an event of first importance in itself. As a harbinger of the fifty other poets which one commentator predicts his advent will inspire, Paul Engle is a phenomenon before which a quickened civilization may well stand in awe. He has both the social passion and the social vision, and he is a rare artist on the weaving of words.

Hail the new day!

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

In a series of articles published in the *Nation* some years ago, Arkansas was rated as the lowest state in the Union from the standpoint of literacy and culture. Now the Arkansas Legislature has voted by an overwhelming majority *not* to hear Huey Long. The cultural advance in that state in recent years must have been phenomenal!

Three disastrous train wrecks in Russia in a period of five weeks would seem to indicate that shooting engineers and train dispatchers is not the surest way of securing safety on the rails.

The AAA was so successful last year in its grain-destroying policy that in January last the country imported from Argentina 330,000 bushels of wheat and 2,664,000 bushels of oats. Give the AAA free rein, and perhaps in another year we may have to import all our food. That would be success indeed!

Mr. Roosevelt declares, in his recent message to Congress asking for the extension of the NRA, that this NRA has abolished child labor. This being the case, there seems to be a lot of unnecessary hullaballoo over the Child Labor Amendment to the Constitution.

At 3 A. M. the other night, President Roosevelt was awakened by the roaring of a huge aeroplane over the White House. The next morning he complained, and orders were forthwith issued that no planes were to fly in the future over the White House grounds. *O, to be President!*

The cost of food is expected to be up 11 per cent by July 1st next, and the cost of meat 32 per cent. Hurrah for a President who never forgets "the forgotten man!"

J. H. H.

Liquidating World Depression

Some energetic economist might well collate and catalogue both the ascribed causes of the depression and the numerous remedies prescribed to a suffering world for emergence therefrom. Despite the conflicting theories thus gathered together and the confusions of thought thereby engendered, there looms at least one "bright particular star" to guide our feet. Enough time has now elapsed and adequate perspective developed to make it incontrovertibly clear that the overwhelming cause of our economic woes was the frightful wastage of the World War and its turbulent and profligate aftermath. The generally accepted estimate of the cost of the war in economic waste is three hundred billion dollars, or approximately one-third of the accumulated wealth of the world. Not content with this exhibition of economic insanity, the nations, intent upon maintaining an indefinite armed peace, have expended on new armaments since the armistice the incredible sum of fifty billion dollars. With Europe now echoing alarums of war, expenditures for world armaments have been boosted up to six billion dollars a year. This mad race to the "next war" is being run at crushing expense and at the fatal risk of civilization itself. The situation defies rhetorical exaggeration. Probably one hundred million of the people of America and Europe are living under the subsistence level. This large part of the human family in daily want offers a shameful contrast to the official investment of many billions of dollars every year in instruments of slaughter. The world now has the greatest sum total of armaments in history and the twentieth century is challenged to vindicate its right to the name "civilization" by inaugurating a general holiday in armament building to assure recovery from the protracted ravages of the depression. We have had a moratorium on debts; why, for example, can not a moratorium on arms construction be declared by all the nations? It is difficult to conceive of a single plausible objection to such moratorium or holiday by any nation acting in good faith.

The plan proposed herein is offered as a way out of this international labyrinth. It seeks largely to relieve the after-burdens of the war, drastically reduce the staggering costs of armaments, revive for our farmers and manufacturers a normal foreign market, stabilize world currencies by international agreement, make possible a return to prosperity, and to promote genuine and durable world peace. It does not exclude nor hamper other constructive measures, but, on the contrary, it will serve to facilitate and insure them.

Two of the cardinal assumptions of the plan are:

1. That the World War and the two post-war panics have so shrunk the wealth, so stagnated the business, so burdened the budgets, and so crippled the paying power of the nations that a new, comprehensive and mutually advantageous readjustment of the war legacies is made necessary in the common interest.

2. That the United States, being the only clear creditor among the nations, and having expended thirty-eight billion dollars (exclusive of our loans and credits to the Allies) in the war, without asking, or receiving, any compensation therefor at the peace table, has the right and faces the duty to make these proposals and demands in the name of justice, stability, suffering humanity, and world peace.

The arithmetic of the plan is summarized as follows:

OUTLINE OF PLAN
(I to VII)

I

Allied Payments to the United States

Total principal amount, in round numbers, of loans and credits by the United States to the Allies during the war and shortly after the Armistice, commonly called "Allied debts"	$10,000,000,000
The United States to be paid in all a total sum of 60% of such principal amount, or	6,000,000,000
Upon such 60% the Allies are given credit for the amounts already paid in cash	2,700,000,000
Balance of the 60% remaining to be paid by the Allies to the United States	3,300,000,000
The plan provides that this balance of $3,300,000,000 be divided into 12 equal annual installments and paid as follows:	
Immediate cash payment on the consummation of settlement, say, June 15, 1935	275,000,000

And a like amount of $275,000,000 on June 15 of each of the next eleven succeeding years. The eleven deferred annuities to be secured or guaranteed in a manner satisfactory to the United States so that the adjustment thus made will be final and not subject to revision or reconsideration at any future time. Installment annuities to bear interest after their respective maturities at the rate of 5% per annum.

Memo: (a) and (b).

(a) As this adjustment would go into effect at the close of the three years of grace given to Germany under the 10% 1932 Lausanne conditional settlement between the Allies and Germany, there will be owing to the Allies from Germany under the Lausanne settlement the sum of	$800,000,000

The payment thereof by Germany would terminate and discharge all the Allied claims for reparations against her. This would reduce the sum needed to be raised by the Allies for payments hereunder to $2,500,000,000, or about 200 million dollars a year for only 12 years as against the previous debt settlements which called for similar annual installments for 62 years.

(b) The 60%, or $6,000,000,000 is a lump sum or joint settlement, the Allies to determine their respective contributions or percentages of payment thereof as among themselves. This lump sum settlement would relieve the United States of the burden, delay and friction of the previous protracted negotiations with a dozen or more nations, and we would avoid discussing the unjust disparities claimed by certain Allies in the former settlements. There is no reason why the Allies should not settle their own differences and disparities of payment by themselves. The negotiations to that end may also force the solution of some of the acute political problems which so disturb Europe and whose settlement would greatly advance the peace of Europe. Indeed, such debt settlement by us might well super-

induce general appeasement so vitally needed in Europe, and thus greatly facilitate the drastic universal reduction of armaments without which durable world peace can never be attained.

II.

German Payments to the United States

The United States to accept in adjustment and compromise of our two claims against Germany, one arising from the Army of Occupation costs, and the other from the Mixed Claims Commission, the same percentage basis as in the case of the Allied indebtedness, namely, 60% of the original principal, crediting thereon the cash amounts heretofore paid by Germany to the United States:

(a) Army of Occupation costs $250,000,000		
60% of original principal...$150,000,000		
Less cash paid by Germany thereon	68,000,000	$ 82,000,000
(b) Mixed Claims Commission original principal $227,000,000		
60% thereon	136,000,000	
Less cash paid by Germany thereon	52,000,000	84,000,000
Total amount of German settlement with the United States in 12 years.....		$166,000,000

This amount, $166,000,000 to be paid by Germany to the United States in twelve equal installments of $14,000,000 each, beginning June 15, 1935, the installments to bear interest at the rate of 5% after maturity.

III.

Liquidation of Allied and Inter-Allied Debts and Reparations

All the inter-Allied debts (that is, debts owing by the European Allies among themselves as distinguished from the Allied debts which are owing to the United States) arising from the war and of which there are, roughly speaking, $7,000,000,000 owing to Great Britain, $2,000,000,000 owing to France and $1,000,000,000 owing to Italy, to be cancelled and discharged. Thus the whole tangled network of Allied and inter-Allied debts and of German reparations, which at the time of the June, 1931, moratorium amounted to the colossal grand total of thirty billion dollars, can be disentangled and discharged upon the payment of about 15% thereof or four and a quarter billion dollars.

IV.

General Disarmament

All the foregoing adjustments and settlements to be conditioned upon the general and reciprocal acceptance of a drastic program of disarmament, as nearly universal as possible. This program to consist of two parts:

(a) A complete holiday (subject to completions, replacements and repairs under existing disarmament treaties) in all types of armament construction for a period of 5 years, that is, until after assured recovery from the ravages of the economic depression.

(b) Progressive and, as far as is equitable, proportional reduction of armaments during the 5-year holiday so that at the end of the holiday period the total reduction will be substantially 50% of their present level.

The money savings to be effected by these two processes of disarmament are conservatively estimated to be:

Holiday saving for the United States for each of the 5 years.....	$ 300,000,000
50% reduction per year for the United States after 5-year holiday.....	250,000,000
Holiday saving for Europe for each of the 5 years.....	1,200,000,000
Savings on 50% reduction per year for Europe after the holiday.....	750,000,000

V.

Benefits Under the Plan to United States and Europe

The annual benefits to our budget by the payments to and savings by the United States under this plan are:

Annual payment in cash by the Allies to the United States.....	$275,000,000
German annual payments to United States in settlement hereunder.....	14,000,000
Annual savings to the United States by armament holiday	300,000,000
Total per annum.....	$589,000,000

Summarizing the foregoing benefits to the United States, computed for the 12-year period,. we have:

Amount received from Allies on the War Debt settlement hereunder would be $275,000,000 a year for 12 consecutive years, making a total cash payment of.....	$3,300,000,000
Amount received from Germany in settlement of our two claims against her would be $14,000,000 a year for 12 consecutive years, making a total cash payment of.....	166,000,000
Saving to our budget by armament holiday and drastic reduction for 12 years (estimated) $300,000,000 a year for 5 years of holiday, or $1,500,0000,000 and $250,000,000 a year for the remaining 7 years or $1,750,000,000, making a joint total in armament savings for 12 years..	3,250,000,000
Total from payments and relief from armaments under this plan.....	$6,715,000,000
Add the amount of cash hitherto received from the Allies.....	2,700,000,000
And we have a grand total of payments by the Allies and Germany owing to the United States, plus our own savings on armaments of.....	9,415,000,000

The amount of savings under the 50% reduction of armaments is necessarily an estimate. However, even exclusive of the recent "billion dollar" Vinson Naval Bill, which largely goes into effect in 1936 and which could be suspended under the proposed plan, it is conservative to fix the amount of our savings at two hundred fifty million dollars annually.

The payments and savings under this plan would easily enable the balancing of our federal budget commencing with the fiscal year 1937.

After the twelve years the item of annual savings in armaments of two hundred fifty million dollars (or whatever it exactly is) would continue indefinitely until changed by international agreement.

From the figures shown in Provision

IV above, Europe will save on armaments alone during the 12-year period at least.....$10,000,000,000

which ought greatly to ease the burden of payments hereunder and their yearly transfer.

The Allies are getting under this plan another large reduction of their debt, and will continue to have the benefit of the 50% reduction of armaments indefinitely at the annual rate of.....$ 750,000,000

Also, the reopening of the world trade and the general stimulation of good will and economic appeasement would be of tremendous mutual advantage, and Europe and the United States would benefit from the increased foreign buying power of each.

VI.

Monetary and Trade Agreements

The agenda for a conference to consider the plan should include the question of currency stabilization by international agreement and the question of the advisability of the return to a gold standard, likewise by international agreement, and reciprocal tariff and other trade arrangements. The natural effect of a general debt-disarmament adjustment, lifting the terrific mortgages of debt and reparations left by the war, would be to facilitate and expedite an adjustment of all these vexing monetary and economic problems in the spirit of fair play and common benefit. Recent developments have brought sharply to public attention the necessity of international agreement on the stabilization of currencies and the money standard of the world. It is difficult to visualize satisfactory world trade unless these acute problems are disposed of in the sunlight of good will and mutual interest.

VII.

Although the United States Government has no direct or legal interest therein, it is hoped that in removing causes of international friction all the old disputed and so-called "repudiated" claims of British and other foreign subjects against ten of our sovereign states, be abandoned and discharged. The states involved are: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, North Carolina and South Carolina. These claims have nothing to do with our Civil War; some date back as far as 1842 (Mississippi) and as late as 1884 (Arkansas). The details of these so-called "repudiated" claims are fully set forth in a paper procurable from the Treasury Department, entitled, "Repudiation of State Indebtedness" and bearing date "Revised May 15, 1930."

In short, there should be the broadest and most comprehensive adjustment and cleanup possible. The piecemeal and partial settlements dragged out through the past 13 years have got the world nowhere in terms of durable accomplishment. The reluctant and disappointing concessions made through these years have engendered friction rather than good will. The time has come for the nations, whose peoples are all suffering from the burdens of the war and the depression, to meet together with the determination to tackle and solve all the important questions that block international trade, prosperity and world peace. Representatives of the nations should be selected for their ability to work out a program of reciprocal concession and sacrifice for the common good. While the United States should deservedly take the leadership in this movement and its people are willing to make further sacrifices beyond those already unprecedentedly made, it should not be asked to bear the lion's share of fresh concessions. Uncle Sam's surname is not ATLAS.

Views of President Roosevelt and Others

It is well known that President Roosevelt has been balked in his preliminary efforts in the international field by the recurrent tendency of certain foreign emissaries to seek only those adjustments which are particularly beneficial to their countries. For example, emphasis is always laid by them on *drastic reduction of the debts.* A factor that is far more important, one that promises the greatest aid to financial recuperation and makes further debt reduction attractive, is *drastic reduction of armaments.* On the occasion of the meeting of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation in December 1933 President Roosevelt, in a notable address, said that *"At least 90 per cent of the world's population are willing further to reduce their armed forces tomorrow if every other nation in the world will agree to do the same thing."* * * *If this 10 per cent can be persuaded by the other 90 per cent to do their own thinking and not be led, *we will have practical peace, permanent peace, real peace, throughout the world."*

It seems President Roosevelt's view is that the questions of armaments and of debts should be linked together and adjusted together for the greatest possible benefit both to this country and to the world. It is not a question of logical relationship but of common sense and practical results. And this epitomizes the overwhelming sentiment of the American people.

Senator Borah, in a Senate speech in 1933, said: "So far as the debts in and of themselves are concerned, taking the debts naked and alone, there is no justification for the reduction or cancellation of these debts. But that is not all there is to this problem. * * * If we could open the markets for the American farm, revive trade and commerce, re-establish our monetary systems upon a sound basis, and drastically reduce the armaments of the world—speaking now of armaments purely as an economic proposition—I think it would be infinitely more valuable to the people of the United States than the payment of the debts. Whenever a program is presented which gives reasonable assurance that there will be a readjustment of the post-war problems which in my judgment now stand in the way of normal operation of economic laws, and if these debts can be used in such a program to break the depression, I shall not hesitate to support the program."

The leading nations have from time to time the past two years given frequent expression to their respective countries' desire to reduce armaments and to advance the cause of world peace. These nations include both Germany and Japan. In the fall of 1934 Germany announced her willingness to return to the Disarmament Conference and even to agree upon general control and supervision of arms in Europe, insisting, however, upon equality of arms for herself. Both Chancellor Hitler and his aide, Dr. Hess, made this clear in their speeches. As late as February 24, 1935, Chancellor Hitler, speaking at Munich on the celebration of the 15th anniversary of the founding of the National Socialist party, said: "We demand a guarantee of equality, freedom and self-maintenance. With it, German honor rises again. We only know a 'No' and 'Yes'—always 'Yes' for peace and always 'No' for disregard of German honor. The world must recognize our 'Yes' remains 'Yes' and 'No' remains 'No.' "

On October 29, 1934, Japan's Washington Ambassador, Hiroshi Saito, passed through Chicago and was interviewed on the subject of armaments and the then current Naval Conference in London. He said emphatically, "Japan favors drastic reduction of armament by everyone."

Of course, the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy and Russia have proclaimed just as strongly their devotion to world peace and their desire for drastic reduction of armaments.

If all these nations mean what they have all said then drastic reduction of armament ought certainly to be attainable. If it is feared that some of them do not mean it, then it is high time that civilization has a showdown on this subject. A conference to consider and carry out some such proposal as contained herein might constitute an international Who's Who on this vital question. A definite line-up of the nations for peace by concrete action should be ascertained.

Recent disclosures in the opening sessions of our Senate's investigation of the manufacture and sale of arms were of such a nature that the responsible heads of the nations should welcome an opportunity to prove that they are not directly or indirectly in league with armament manufacturers and that they and their peoples are willing and eager to join in an equitable and drastic diminution of arms. This also would furnish an opportunity for the nations which are solemnly pledged so to do under Article 8 of the League Covenant, to cut down their burden of arms. Too long has this pledge lain fallow. The crisis is here; all the munition factories in Europe are running at full speed and somebody must take the lead to stop the explosion that is inevitable if this thing continues. It is as if the whole world were living at the foot of a smoking volcano. Is civilization helpless?

Thus we see that reduction of armaments has vital relationship to both economic recovery and world peace. Just as the greatest saving can be made through a holiday in arms construction and drastic reduction of armaments, likewise peace pacts and peace commitments lose far too much of their practical value unless and until they are validated by drastic reduction of arms by all the nations. For if the disarmament is both general and as nearly pro rata as practicable, the fear of war would be abated and dispelled. It is too much to ask any nation alone to disarm for the sake of the example, just as it is equally unfair to ask the United States to cancel the war debts as a pure international gift.

Here then in the proposal drastically to reduce armaments God and Mammon meet for the first time—the God of peace and the Mammon of money-saving.

The foregoing plan is submitted as a people's plan, a business man's plan, free from technicalities, comprehensively covering most of the acute problems now plaguing international relations, suggesting a course of adjustment in harmony with present world economic conditions, and reasonably just and equitable to all the nations.

The will to adjust is the will to peace.

SALMON O. LEVINSON.

British Rearmament Policy for 'Imperial' Defense

Primarily being a woman, who is by nature pacific, secondly, being a Nationalist Indian accepting Non-Violence—the creed of the Indian National Congress and thirdly, being a member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom which stands for the principle of universal disarmament, I was an interested onlooker during the Disarmament drama which was staged in Geneva. Moreover, being a subject of the nation which took upon itself to play the "Star" role as the leading champion of pacifism and pan-universal peacemaker, my interest was naturally more markedly drawn to the part played in this Disarmament drama by Great Britain, than any other of the performers.

Britain won a crown of laurels in having presented 59 different Peace programs to the world, prior to the Disarmament Conference session in 1933. Such a heroic feat gained her a round of applause from all corners of the world. But alas! before the curtain has been finally rung down, there comes Mr. Baldwin's statement on rearmament as an anti-climax!

Apropos of this volte face, many recollections buried under the dust of twenty years and more reappear on the surface of one's mind. Sir Herbert Samuel's indictment of the British Government's rearmament policy as a throw-back to conditions prevalent in pre-war days, recalls a passage by the eminent Belgian diplomat Greindl, in his record of British political turpitude during the pre-war period. The substance of the impression he conveyed was, that the peace of the world was never more seriously jeopardized than since Britain busied herself with trying to consolidate it.

Before, as well as after the war, there was a persistent and unanimous opinion that "left to themselves France and Germany would reach a settlement of their differences, and that British diplomacy was being continually exercised to envenom the controversy and to draw a circle of hostile alliances round Germany." In view of the same British diplomacy now exercising its efforts at a rapprochement between these two nations, one can not but ponder over the calamitous part Britain played in regard to,—what is well known as—the Morocco affair. An affair in which Britain "pitched a flaming torch into the powder magazine of European rivalries in order to buy off a rival (Germany)." Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, in his Foreword to E. D. Morel's "Ten Years of Secret Diplomacy" in referring to the affair wrote:

> To the peoples of France, Germany and Britain the land of the Moors was but a name; hardly that. In the complex play and interplay of diplomatic intrigue of national vanity and antipathies—Morocco became a symbol and a portent. It is all ancient history now, it may be said, we have our Egypt and France her Morocco, and the end has justified the means.

It is as true today as it was when Macdonald averred that "the Morocco affair slammed the doors in the face of the peacemakers of Europe," for Germany can not have forgotten how, as Prince Bülow—then Chancellor—wrote in his book "Imperial Germany";

> The two (French and English) Powers disposed arrogantly of a great and most important field of colonial interests, without even deigning to take the German Empire into consideration. It was clearly an attempt on the part of the Western Powers to lay claim to a right of decision in matters of international policy. The French authorities did not hesitate to act immediately upon the Anglo-French arrangements, as if the signatory Powers of the Treaty of Madrid had no existence at all.

Prince Bülow based Germany's case on the Madrid

Convention of 1880, the German-Moroccan commercial Treaty of 1890, etc.

Every student of the history of the World War is aware that it was the outcome of rivalries among European powers for ascendency of power in the East. Wilfred Scawen Blunt in his "My Diaries" noted:

There is very little doubt that the partition of the whole of Asia is in the program of our (British) Foreign Office, and would already be a *fait accompli* but for Kaiser Wilhelm.

Germany's rising power in the East thus transformed "Morocco into a symbol and a portent." Ever since Germany usurped from Britain the concession from the Sultan of Turkey in 1899 to construct the Berlin-Bagdad railway, thereby threatening Britain's imperialistic, economic and commercial surpremacy in the East,—especially her monopoly in India—Britain's one fixed intention has been to relieve herself from "that irritating incubus (Germany) in Egypt." With that object in view Britain found herself compelled to ally herself "and compound her colonial rivalries in Africa with her hereditary enemy," France. The result of this hostility of Britain against Germany culminated in France's "carrying out the invasion of Morocco, to which her only claim was the cession by England to her of rights which England never herself possessed," in defiance of *solemn promises* given to *the Sultan of Morocco "to preserve the independence and territorial integrity of the Empire of Morocco,"* by *entering into a secret treaty with France and flouting the rights Germany held in Morocco under an International Convention.* All international commentators have voiced their opinion that this Morocco affair was the first cause of the disruption in Europe that culminated in the World War. And it is *not* "all ancient history now" as Mr. Ramsay Macdonald preferred to consider the Morocco affair, since Britain has her Egypt and France her Morocco. Germany, whose interests were ignored at the time, and later on "defeated" in the World War, no longer considers herself "defeated."

Britain—hailed by Europe, as the Archangel of Peace—instead of exerting her efforts any more to find "some other way," prepares to fight against "the incubus in Egypt" now threatening her supremacy in the East. Likewise Turkey, another "incubus," Germany's ally, one of the "defeated" powers and a victim of the Versailles Treaty, "desires abandonment of the treaty, and claims the right to defend her own territory in her own way," a demand which virtually implies reclamation of the supremacy enjoyed before the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. So Britain has to gird up her loins to fight Turkey!

So, although the increase of Air Forces in England is explained to the people of the country as a "defense" measure, it is obvious that it is motivated by a spirit of pure "aggressive" intent to perpetuate her Imperialistic hold over *the routes to India.* It can not be from any fear of "aggression" on her island kingdom that she is taking this "defense" measure. From what quarter can Britain possibly fear an "attack," considering the cordon of "ententes" with her immediate neighbors (especially France) in which her *national* security is assured? From what European concert of Powers does she need to "defend" her shores as Germany, single-handed, can not possibly entertain any such grotesque idea as "attacking" the British Isles. Therefore it is clear that it is not as a measure of "defense" that the British Government is once more out to commit the country to a policy, in flagrant contradiction to the ultra-pacifist attitude she took upon herself as pan-universal peacemaker at the Disarmament Conference.

Strangely enough, with Britain's avowed "love of peace," it is a notorious fact that "Britain has fought more wars in 200 years than any other European States." She fought one hundred and eleven wars to "found the Indian Empire"! Her precepts of pacific sentiments have always been found to be anomalous in practice. Her part in the World War was evidently not for the sake of the idealism of great principles such as: War to end war, the authority of international law, the sanctity of treaties, the right of small States to live their own lives unmolested by powerful and covetous neighbors; and not to conquer territory, to capture markets, to cripple a commercial rival whose competition had become inconvenient, much less break up enemy empire, as William Harbutt Dawson in his "Problems of Peace" claims on behalf of Britain, for the spirit of each and every one of those items has been violated in letter. The truth of the foregoing statement is borne out by a passage in the preface of Mr. Gilbert Murray's book, where he says:

I think few students of public affairs will dispute that the long strain of the war, confusing our idea of good and evil, and at times centering our hopes upon things which a normal civilized man regards with loathing has resulted in a widespread degradation of political conduct. Things are done now, in time of peace, which would have been inconceivable before 1914. And they are done now because we grew accustomed to worse things during the war.

He cities certain instances and comments on them: "Such things used to happen in Mexico; but they happen in Great Britain." Britain's part in the World War is more honestly disclosed by G. Lowes Dickinson in his "The International Anarchy, 1904-1914" in which he frankly states:

But what were the objects for which these commitments (ententes) were made? Our own power, our own empire, our own security.

Nor would Britain hesitate today to maintain the latter as against the former declaration. For centuries past England has set herself out to oust (not merely seek "parity") every foreign militaristic force, and what actuated her was not the fears she feigned that those powers might "attack" her, but that they might wrest from her the power she monopolized in the possessions she had gained through "War and Conquest" in the East. When naval strength was the criterion of power, it was not because of seeking "parity" with Holland that she waged a battle with that country. Was it "parity" Britain sought when she fought France and Denmark? In the case of the destruction of the last mentioned country's vessels, it is known as a historical fact how "without the ghost of an excuse they were destroyed by Admiral Nelson, who entered the harbor of Copenhagen as a *friend*"!

Germany had been looked upon as a rival for the market of India, and so every nerve was strained during the last war to annihilate her. The ulterior object of the British Government's Rearmament policy therefore can be summed up briefly as being one by which she is determined to safeguard the routes to India by sea, land and now air. She must retain her imperialistic hold in the East for that purpose, whether the Disarmament Conference fail, or the peace of the world be at stake, or the countries such as Turkey, Persia and Egypt—whose interests Britain has trodden to dust under the heels of her imperialistic arrogance—revolt in resentment against her "aggression" on their territories to secure her unobstructed passage to India. Nothing

matters, nothing is of any consequence so long as Britain can continue to hold her Indian Empire! The passage to India and India itself has been graphically outlined by John Bakeless in his "The Origin of the Next War" at the beginning of the chapter titled "The Tensions of the Modern World: The Mediterranean," wherein he says:

If you draw a line from London down the Thames, through the English Channel, past the Bay of Biscay where France curves out to meet Spain, through the Strait of Gibraltar, over the Mediterranean, past the island of Malta, between the sun-baked banks of the Suez Canal, along the torrid length of the Red Sea, out into the Gulf of Aden, through the Indian Ocean to Bombay and Calcutta;—you will have traced an exact outline of the British (Indian) Empire's backbone. Cut that line at any point East of India and imperial Britain staggers. Cut it at any point West of India and keep it cut—and the greatest Empire of all time perishes like a hanged man or a pithed frog or any other vertebrate whose spinal marrow has been snapped. India and the security of the route to India are absolutely vital to Great Britain. That is one of the central facts in world politics, as it has been ever since Great Britain became an industrial state. For India, though its people are sorely impoverished, is so enormous, so densely populated, and possesses such undeveloped native industries, that it provides an indispensable market for British goods, on which depends the prosperity, indeed the very existence, of hundreds of British factories, their owners, and their workers.

At this stage, it would not be out of place to point out that the tactics by which Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. Oswald Mosley & Co. are advocating to the people of Great Britain to maintain that "indispensable market for British goods" for the prosperity and existence of the hundreds of British factories, their owners, and their workers, are the most perilous. In trying to urge upon the people of Great Britain to "substitute a big stick (of Fascism) for goodwill" these gentlemen are out to perpetrate the most heinous crime against the people of their own country, leading them to their doom.

If the people of Great Britain allow themselves to be prevailed upon by either Messrs. Churchill, Mosley & Co. to use the "big stick" on India and in the process break the backbone of the Indian Empire, and reduce it to the condition of a "pithed frog" or accede to the reactionary influences liberated by the overbearing imperialistic fanatics such as "Lord Hailsham and Neville Chamberlain, Lord Rothermere and the service members" who, as an editorial note in the *Manchester Guardian* on the 30th of July points out, are those who "have overborne him (Mr. Baldwin)" in committing the country to the disastrous policy of Rearmament,—the people of Great Britain may be taken to have surely signed their own death warrant! A Government rendered desperately weak, both politically and morally, has no other alternative left than to bolster itself up with what support it can get by appealing to the illusory conceptions of the "glory" and "patriotism" of the nation. It plays upon the patriotic sentiments and imagination of the people by unfurling "the vision of a national flag floating in distant ports, symbol of far-reaching national power, a vision which throws a glamour of greatness upon every citizen of the ruling state. The strength of these insidious influences in moulding public policy, we shall not attempt to measure, ——" The sole object of this kind of "insidious" appeal is to persuade the people to lend their support to the Government's militaristic policies to maintain the "dominion over conquered peoples—a satisfaction of vanity which appeals to all men." Hence the juggling with the stock-in-trade words of imperial militarism—"defense" and "aggression." To the people of Great Britain the vision of the Union Jack floating over the Indian Empire is dangled to conjure up the "glory" of the nation! It seems, that on the determination to retain and defend that strip of cloth hinges the momentous question of the day,—World Peace or World War.

Is it possible that the people of Britain can still be deceived as to the true significance of this "Empire," when they see it in its nakedness "shorn of wrongful privilege over the conquered millions? Would 'possessions' still continue to lure the people of Great Britain to war as a shimmering mirage lures us on to naked deserts, if they but weigh them in the balance with the prizes of peaceful industry?" So asked Mr. Oscar T. Crosby, whom I had the pleasure of meeting in Washington,—in his humane treatment of the subject "International War," a question which the people of England would do well to ask themselves once for all, keeping in view the fact that on its answer *this time* they make their final choice whether Great Britain as a nation is to prosper or perish. It seems well nigh inconceivable that the British people would once more allow themselves to be fooled and drawn into another 1914, by such phrases as "a heavily armed Britain is the best guarantee for world peace" or by such fallacious arguments as advanced by Mr. Baldwin in reply to the Labor party's vote of censure on the Government for its air rearmament, in so far as they were brought forward on the plea of "collective security", "parity" and the rest of such stratocratic jargon. But attention may be called to that part of the speech where Mr. Baldwin has sought to call up the ghost of Robert Walpole to enunciate the chief reason for the Government's adoption of this policy of Rearmament. Through Robert Walpole, Mr. Baldwin put forth the same old hackneyed appeal:

If we allow our *prestige* to be impaired, if we shirk *responsibility,* and let things of the moment go by default—*in other words, if we cease to care whether our strength is noticed or not*—we lose the chief security for our independence, and we risk our own ruin.

It is the "strength" of imperialism, its defense against prospective menace of the claims of rival imperialism which is the basis of the "prestige" and "responsibility", all the Prime Ministers of peace-loving England have called upon the people to uphold. Where has this pride of military glory led the country but to unending strife and clash with the nine other rivals?

Just such a speech as Mr. Baldwin's, delivered by Mr. Lloyd George, three years before the war, at a banquet given by the Lord Mayor to the Directors of the Bank of England, served to invoke the same spirit of false patriotic consciousness. Mr. Lloyd George was inspired to declare on that occasion:

I would make great sacrifices to preserve peace. I conceive that nothing could justify a disturbance of international good will except questions of the gravest national moment. But if a situation were to be forced upon us in which peace could only be preserved by surrender of the great and beneficent position Britain has won by centuries of heroism and achievement—then I emphatically say that peace at that price would be a humiliation intolerable for a great country like ours to endure.

Lloyd George stood as Peace incarnate with a sword which he flourished before the eyes of the British people as a flaming weapon with which he proclaimed to "destroy Prussian militarism, and recreate civilization on the foundations of morality and religion." He kissed this "sword" (not the Cross his Christ had kissed!) and sent forth the clarion call to the people of his country to march along with him in this crusade, and so they did! Christian soldiers marched out kissing the "sword" of Peace! Little did the soldiers suspect

that they had been called out to lay down their lives, not for Peace, not for the "Kaiser's head"; the living symbol at that time of "Prussian militarism," but as it proved to turn out,—a campaign for a General Election in which Mr. Lloyd George "was trying to get a very large majority in the House of Commons and to crush his old colleagues, and conceivable rivals, entirely out of existence. Of course he succeeded." This is the disclosure that was made by the Prime Minister's supporters and told to Gilbert Murray when "bewildered at this program" he tried to find out what motive could lie at the back of it. Even a man of Gilbert Murray's caliber fell a victim to the powers of darkness. He supported the war. But his conscience smote him and he made manifest his remorse in passages of his little booklet written in retrospect of the war, in the preface to "Problems of Foreign Policy." He writes of the Prime Minister's incredible failure:

> Never in the whole course of modern history has there been a more magnificent opportunity than then lay before the British Prime Minister, never has there been a clearer call of plain duty. Great Britain hung on his lips, and Europe was waiting for the lead of Great Britain. It was for him to choose plain good or plain evil. And he chose, deliberately, evil. This man had before him a task and an opportunity so glorious that one can scarcely speak of it except in the language of religion. Many ordinary men would willingly give their lives if they could save their fellow-creatures from sufferings and perils far less terrible than those which then threatened. And he could have saved them without sacrifice. It needed a little courage.

This reproach of Mr. Gilbert Murray against the then British Prime Minister for his lack of a "little courage" at the time of that crisis may well be applied verbatim against the Prime Minister of England today, for the very same lack of "a little courage."

(Mrs.) Mayadevi Gangulee.

Geneva, Switzerland.

Boy Lost!

"Little Percy C. has disappeared and has not been seen for an hour or more." This was the word relayed to his neighbors, permanent and summer, at dusk of a day in late August. Every one supposed that a few minutes search would find the dear little fellow, so that none of us at first was greatly perturbed. Both men and women of the near by farm houses and summer cottages turned out and helped in the search of premises and adjoining fields.

The darkness meanwhile was creeping on, and the coolness of evening increasing. Two sinister facts were in everybody's mind. One was that just about a year before an old lady had disappeared from a boarding place a few miles away, and her body was not discovered till some months after in the woods a quarter of a mile away from her starting point. Another fact was that thick woods, with precipitous ledges scattered through them, came to within a hundred feet at the rear of the little fellow's home; while in the other direction, across the road and beyond a narrow field was the rocky shore of Penobscot Bay. The water washing the base of its steep ledges was deep and cold.

Telephone messages spread the word over the country side. Automobiles began to arrive from near and far. Recruits were added to the searchers, equipped now with searchlights and lanterns. Storekeepers from other villages were thoughtful enough to bring along their entire stock of flashlights and spare batteries. More or less formally the hunt was organized, and we marched back up through the woods behind the house, keeping closely enough together to cover all the territory traveled over, beating our way through underbrush, and over rocks big and little. Others, unorganized, alone or in groups of two and three, covered the shoreline back and forth, through bushes and over ledges, or again through mud ankle-deep in the small coves, hoping, and dreading. All now in complete darkness, save for the flash of the torch. The Maine night was growing colder.

Hope was placed in a dog, the constant companion of his little master, which had disappeared presumably with him. Presently the dog appeared alone, and could not be persuaded to go back into the woods from which he had emerged. The only bit of comfort lay in the fact that his appearance indicated that the woods and not the sea contained the clue to the mystery. The distracted young mother meanwhile bore up as best she could, helped and encouraged by her women friends and neighbors who had gathered in and about the house. The father was out with the others who were faithfully tramping through the woods, marshaled to the task by one of the neighbors who had had similar experiences before.

The nearest station of the State Troopers was at Bangor, fifty miles away. A telephone message to them brought the assuring word that one of their number was starting, and that another was being summoned from near Ellsworth, forty miles distant. Both arrived about eleven o'clock. Their questioning of parents and others convinced them that kidnapping need not be considered. And so the search was renewed with increased vigor, and more systematic organization.

Meantime the crowds grew to unprecedented proportions for our little neighborhood. Every household for miles around seemed to be represented. It was estimated that near to one hundred automobiles were parked along our short stretch of road, where at other times each separate car was scanned with curiosity as to what errand had brought it there. Headlights and flashlights all about made a weird and never to be forgotten picture. The presence of the state troopers brought great encouragement to the ever-growing band of searchers. The state of Maine had reached out its long strong arm to save if possible the life of an only child. At last, about one o'clock, the widely scattered searchers, the neighbors, permanent residents and summer people heard the siren of the police motorcycle. This could mean nothing but that the long search was over and the lost boy was found. A short period of suspense as to his condition was ended as he was brought to his anxious parents, alive, and to all appearances well. One of the volunteer helpers had found him soundly sleeping under a tree in the midst of the woods, a quarter to half a mile distant from home.

So ended the most dramatic episode from real life that it has ever been vouchsafed to the present writer to witness. And from that eventful night he has drawn the inspiration of a great faith in the soundness of our American civilization, and the hope that it may keep that soundness far into the future, so long as it is determined that "not one of these little ones shall perish."

James A. Fairley.

Some Men Worth Knowing

1. Frederick W. Shorter of Seattle

One of the best known ministers in Seattle is Frederick W. Shorter. The "radicals" down on the "skid-road" know him—so do the "conservatives" on "High-land Drive" on Queen Anne Hill. And, they know him out at the big University of Washington, in whose vicinity the Repertory Theatre is located, in which he holds the services of the Church of the People. A year ago he was the minister of Pilgrim Congregational Church on Capitol Hill. Last spring at a church meeting he was by vote of the church asked to retire. He did, and on the following Sunday, in the theatre, began with a new organization, which started with fifty members, and now has 250.

He is an ardent believer in the Sermon on the Mount, in the power of non-violence—and he thinks that the capitalist system must be eliminated, if the Society of Jesus is ever to be realized. If you looked at him you would think him to be a Quaker, his voice is soft and his manner gentle. It is his plain-speaking that attracts attention and awakens sleeping souls.

I asked a friend who knows him well to give me a sketch of Shorter's life. It is so good and illustrative of American life, that I give this sketch in full. It will be seen why Shorter is worth knowing. It might be called the "Making of an American" and I am mistaken if this sketch is not found in the scrap-book of many readers of UNITY.

"Fred Shorter's pioneering parents turned their young faces away from England toward Australia immediately following their marriage. There he was born and grew up in the seaport city, Sydney. His father was a fruit merchant, and though his family was poor food was plentiful, and the worry and insecurity of poverty never pervaded the home.

"Fred was a precocious, somewhat frail, child. He graduated from the public school at twelve, spending many hours of reading when others were playing. That has left its impress. He takes the world seriously. When he was fourteen he went with his parents and sister and brothers to England. The parents hoped to make their home again in England but they had been too long in the 'colonies' and after six months in the old country returned to Australia. The trip made Fred a new boy, physically, and also laid the basis for his international outlook. He cannot see any difference except superficial ones between peoples. Of course his other travels have helped him.

"Fred was a 'bad' boy at the little neighborhood Congregational church. He was led out by the ear by a stern deacon during a church service and brought before the old minister who slapped him across the face. That settled him for Sunday school and church until a boy friend (he was eleven at this time) invited him to come to his Sunday school where the teachers were not so particular. It was a church of the Disciples. There he met a teacher, a young man, who soon afterwards came to America to study for the ministry. After four years this young man returned and told about the 'glories' of America and Fred was fired to do the same thing. At seventeen he landed at San Francisco. He took his 'conversion' (at age of twelve) very seriously and used to argue with all comers on the plan of salvation. With some other enthusiastic boys of the same age (fourteen-sixteen) he held street corner meetings.

"By working in a department store Fred saved enough money to pay his passage to America. He landed with the required six pounds borrowed from his brother. He had a very unhappy experience with the immigration people—detained for trachoma (which he did not have) and threatened with deportation, a heart-rending experience.

"He had a friend in Pomona and there he worked on an orange ranch until he joined a party, one member of which was Harold Bell Wright, on a cooperative enterprise in the Imperial Valley. The project was a failure. Fred came to know Harold Bell Wright intimately. He made the boy think more seriously than formerly. Wright tried to dissuade Fred from entering the ministry (Wright had just left it). He said it was full of hypocrites and lazy men. One piece of advice Wright gave Fred that he has never forgotten: 'Don't pretend. Be yourself.' Fred has faults but pretense is not one of them. Everyone knows him for what he is and likes or dislikes him accordingly.

"Shorter stayed a year on this ranch and then went to the school his Sunday school teacher had attended—Transylvania College in Lexington, Ky. He worked his way through the preparatory department of that school by selling newspapers, perfumes, books, and washing floors and windows. His teacher helped him get a scholarship that paid tuition. But after three years he tired of the narrowness of the school and with another student studied catalogs and picked out Missouri University. He landed there at the beginning of the summer session, washed dishes for board and had room given him by the dean of the Bible College. There he met Alva Taylor who influenced him greatly. At the University he came under the influence of Arthur Kenyon Rogers in philosophy and Charles A. Ellwood in sociology.

"A turning point in his thinking came one evening shortly after he arrived when he and another student were lying on the campus and suddenly the student asked: 'How does the blood of Jesus save anybody?' That was the beginning of his liberal theology.

"After graduation he went to Yale Divinity and Graduate schools. The most important influence here was D. C. Macintosh. Two years later, when he received his B. D. and M. A. it was Macintosh who influenced him to enlist in the Canadian army. Macintosh had just returned from France where he had served during the summer as a chaplain. In February, 1917, he took train to Kingston, Ont., and joined the Queen's University field ambulance. He was soon overseas, spent a lot of time in training in England, went to France and came back two and a half years later, dazed, and feeling vaguely that the whole thing was crazy. Within a year after his demobilization he had become a pronounced pacifist. Much of that first year he spent loafing around Sydney, whither he had gone to see his mother. He says it took him two years to get back to a normal attitude toward life. His nerves had been affected by his army experience more than he had realized.

"He returned to America and accepted on impulse an offer to teach at Hampton Institute. He taught there a year where he learned to get rid of race prejudice

completely. Ever since he has been a champion and comrade of the Negro. He left Hampton, however, to take graduate sociology at the University of Missouri. There he married and studied for his Ph.D. Dean C. R. Brown happened to come through Columbia (where the University of Missouri is situated) and proposed he go into the ministry. After some deliberation he decided to take Brown's advice and he went to a church in Woodbury, Conn. A year afterwards, he went to Great Falls, Montana. Stayed there three years and came to Seattle—to Pilgrim Church. He was at Pilgrim Church from 1926 to 1934.

"From the very first, Shorter preached a straight-out gospel of pacifism and placed a strong emphasis on the social application of the teachings of Jesus. Pilgrim was conservative and he offended many. It was a hard struggle. During those eight years he became more 'radical' and with the depression this was much intensified. He has always tried to be truly democratic and to welcome all views. But he states his own views very strongly. The climax came with the painting on the walls of a very large Sunday school room of radical murals depicting certain anti-Christian social conditions throughout the world. The older Pilgrim people organized to get him out. The papers gave a great deal of space and publicity to his ousting. It got into the *Nation, Christian Century, Time* and other magazines."

This sketch of Shorter not only shows that he has had an interesting career, but that the "best is yet before him." He is only forty years old—or a little more—is as graceful as Fosdick and would grace any pulpit from the Pacific to the Atlantic. The young people swarm around him. The "radicals" go to him for advice—and the "conservatives" know exactly where to find him. He is British-born but is a thorough-bred American of the Jefferson type. He believes that Garrison was about the biggest American in the last century. He is not only a conscientious objector to war, but he believes in the power of non-violence.

Any church, East or West, would be lucky to have him for a two-months vacation supply. He is a combination of a Gandhi and Garrison—he can be heard easily in the last pew—without shouting—and in the largest auditorium. Nothing would please him better than to talk to a Negro congregation. Practically all colors are in the Church of the People. I told Shorter he might appropriately call his church the Rainbow Church—because of the many colors in thought and skin that are there—also as a Church of Promise!

SYDNEY STRONG.

Trumpets on New Horizon

Conundrum

Coat with fur,
Hat with feather.
Lobsters are boiled alive.
Shoes and bags
In every leather.

How many animals have died,
Hunted, trapped, and crucified,
That I may live at ease?
Fish and fowl and beast,
Slaughtered that I may feast!

And what my caste
And who am I
That I should live,
And these must die?

BERTHA WILLIAMS

And Youth Has Seen

Age has lost the confidence of youth.—
We make our plans, they fail, we plan again;
And youth has seen, with longing eyes, uncouth
Ideas, which, changed could end this waste of men;
And we have failed to see; and patience waned
Will burn desires—like our forgotten prayers.
They see our mammon gods are real, not feigned,
While future burdens caused by greed are theirs.
Yet like a glowing flare their courage beams
And fervor leads to new unthought-of-ways.
Sophisticated, they behold the gleam
From hill-tops—age is lost in an outworn maze.
They cannot fall—the torch is theirs to hold,
And we, unseeing, must not think them bold.

PENELOPE HARRIS

Help the Blind

There is a need of working with the blind
Who will not see, though eyes are sound and clear
Whose cataracts are on the brain, who fear
To think, as cats to swim, whose reasons wind
Like waters where they may; which spill and find
A random course to quickly disappear
And leave at best a worthless, muddy smear,
With gathered debris cluttered and entwined.

We need a system simple as the Braille
For those whose economic sight is weak;
Who grope about a prey to every quack
Who quest the truth as priests the holy grail.
We somehow miss to reach their warped critique,
Their color-blind relief that white is black.

JACK GREENBERG

Prayer from a Texas Hilltop

Make me clean as Texas;
Wash my soul with space;
Purge my dreams with distance;
Turn aside Your face.

Here with treasure buried,
Bareness brought to view,
Help me learn to cherish
Even the search for You.

You have been too generous,
You who are everywhere,
Help me learn to seek You

Make my heart, like Texas,
Offer home for all—
Death, the only boundary;
Love, the answered call.

RALPH CHEYNEY

(*Dedicated to Aline B. Carter*)

Peace Is Here

Mind, seeking for light in darkness,
Harassed with this creed, this dogma, this theory,
And that catchword of mental ramification,
Here is peace.

Heart, beaten upon by this loyalty—
This race, this nation, this family, this church—
Here is peace.

Body, racked on the cannons of war,
Pierced by bayonets, rotted by disease—
Bludgeoned by the daily warfare of life,
Here is peace.

Peace, not in eternal sleep—in death—
But in the union of human thought,
In the loyalty of one human cause.
Peace is here in the love of men.

RAYMOND KRESENSKY

The Study Table

The Story of a Campaign

The literature of Upton Sinclair's EPIC movement promises to become *epic* in proportions and character. This* is the fourth volume of the series—and a thriller! The story it tells, of how the author captured the Democratic Party of California, ran for Governor, and was beaten by the most hideous eruption of demagoguery, slander, and personal betrayal known to contemporary annals in America would be incredible, were it not written by an honest man and backed by quotations, documents, pictures of facsimiles of unimpeachable authenticity. We can recall nothing like it since Ben Lindsay's "The Beast."

First and foremost among the impressions created by this book is that of sheer amazement at Sinclair's accomplishment. We remember talking with him in New York shortly after his announcement of his joining the Democratic Party and of his intention to capture the gubernatorial nomination in the forthcoming election in California. It seemed to us at the time, as we remember it, an utterly crazy scheme. But Sinclair went right ahead and did what he said he was going to do—carried the Democratic primaries, and, in the face of the bitterest opposition of the politicians of both parties abundantly financed by the great business interests of the state, all but carried the election. We know of no more amazing feat in the history of American politics.

How it was done still remains a mystery. The reading of the exciting pages of this book, which gives an almost day by day account of the affair, leaves a wild and whirling impression of crowded headquarters, littered desks, banging typewriters, jangling telephones, rushing automobiles, devoted but untrained volunteer workers making confusion worse confounded, reporters, photographers, microphones and broadcasting studios, campaign journeys, overflowing meetings in vast auditoriums, cranks, clowns, conspirators, unpaid printers' bills, desperate appeals for money, alarums and excursions, hectic days, sleepless nights, and always the clamor of an aroused people for their leader. How the frail and studious Upton Sinclair ever lived through it all, we cannot imagine. How anything was ever done passes all conception. Yet, when the ballots were counted, Sinclair had rolled up a total of 879,000, and his successful rival, Merriam, was a minority victor at the polls.

The real magnitude of this achievement cannot be estimated at its true proportions, however, until one knows the character and power of the opposition which the Sinclair forces encountered from the start. It is the record of what was said and done against him during the campaign which Upton Sinclair has primarily set down in these pages. It was in order that this record might not be lost that he lashed himself to the task of writing this book in the days immediately following the election. Weariness of both flesh and spirit lay heavy upon him, but Sinclair is a skilled writer, his soul was seared, and never has be done a better piece of work. The pages are like the successive explosions of a bunch of fire-crackers. Comedy mingles with tragedy, and irony with the plain, straight narrative of crime. No review can even begin to convey the sheer wickedness of those who fought the EPIC crusader. Words fail even to suggest the ingenuities of falsehood, chicanery, and treason which make up the catalogue of planned and plotted offenses. Newspapers vied with newsreels, and both with the radio, to claim the dubious honor of serving as the chief channel of the poisoned flood of slander. The use, or rather misuse of Upton Sinclair's voluminous writings perhaps caps the climax of iniquity. These writings were vulnerable enough in themselves, for this gallant novelist and pamphleteer has never "drawn his punches," and at one time or another has said harsh things about many kinds of people. But it was not enough to quote the swarming exposures of popular prejudices, religious hypocrisies and patriotic "bunk" which crowd the pages of Sinclair's forty odd volumes. No, these defenders of home and country and Almighty God in California had to distort and garble and invent and forge, and thus make their testimony against Sinclair one putrid mass of lies. We have tried to classify the crimes committed by his enemies—the sins of which they deliberately made themselves guilty in the name of virtue. We find everything that Satan ever conceived and Hell ever punished, with two exceptions. So far as these pages record, the anti-EPIC gang didn't commit murder, and they employed no daughters of joy to try to entice Sinclair into the primrose path of dalliance. We wonder if these two final devices of deviltry were not being held in reserve against the possibility of this popular candidate winning the election!

Familiar names of the great and near great crowd the pages of this book. It is refreshing to find the truth about Governor Rolfe as a drunkard and libertine set down in cold type for all to read. Hearst is handled with unsparing rigor. The picture of the empty, shameless Merriam is drawn to the life. Aimee McPherson is exposed for one moment in a ghastly spotlight. President Roosevelt and many of the distinguished Washington figures are all here in black and white. For the first time we are told what actually happened at Hyde Park when Sinclair waited on his party leader after he won the primaries. Also we are told a tale of a pledge made and broken—set down in these pages without malice, indeed with excess of charity, it seems to us—which does little credit to the occupant of the White House. So far as we can see, Sinclair is scrupulously fair, to friend and foe alike. He indulges in no wild denunciations, and offers no abuse. Even when he is betrayed, as by his old comrade, George Creel, he explains rather than denounces. We count it a marvel that, in days when defeat was still dark upon him, his wounds were still bleeding and bruises sore, Upton Sinclair could write at feverish pace a volume so patient, good-tempered, and on the whole objective as this thrilling narrative of the days when he set California aflame. Incidentally, as we found ourself again and again laughing aloud at the sheer ridiculousness of successive episodes, and at the utterly comical way in which the writer set them forth, we were tempted to meditate upon the problem as to why anybody should suppose that Upton Sinclair was lacking in a sense of humor.

We commend this book to all members of the

*"I, Candidate for Governor, and How I Was Licked," by Upton Sinclair. Published by End Poverty League, Inc., 2306 South Ferguson St., Los Angeles.

UNITY family. It should be read for its own sake as a story of absorbing interest. It should be known as an unforgettable chapter in the political history of this country. Above all, it should be recognized and treasured as a first-hand account of a great uprising of the people in what every day becomes more clear as an era of supreme crisis in the destinies of America.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

A Renaissance Sage

Erasmus of Rotterdam, a Renaissance sage, who towering above his intellectual peers, Bude, Beza, More, and Melancthon, still flings his shadow far down the centuries, takes resurgent bow at the beck of Stefan Zweig (Marie Antoinette's prestidigitator), and, somber-stoled, across his massive sixteenth-century stage, sweeps triumphant—Cartesian in depth of philosophy, Rabelaisian in richness of irony, Pepysian in perfection of persiflage, Shakespearean in height of poetry. Not music but prose, however, best suits this russet-clad spectacle: and, in that somewhat turgid medium, its Humanist outlines may be briefly traced.

Preluding the performance with an overture whose principal motif is toleration (the keynote of the central character), Zweig swiftly assembles his background, where kings, popes, and prophets clash against pagan *philosophes* and milling masses—against this confused kaleidoscopic pageant there appears, calm, clear, unwavering as the Daystar, the personality of Erasmus: proponent of peaceful brotherhood in an age of frenzied fanaticism, dove of peace fluttering amidst a den of lions. Nor does that titanic conflict within the arena abate one jot for the protests of this parti-colored dove (though honored by all), bearing in its beak the olive-branch of unity—in retrospect we can only scrutinize the mind of this Goethe of the Renaissance, and from that study draw whatever conclusions may be of service to our own age, which, rich in invention, schism, and upheaval, is not entirely dissimilar.

Born about 1406 (of naissance even uncertain), Desiderius Erasmus passed an early obscurity in Augustinian monasteries between Brussels, Rheims, and Paris: liberated from scholastic servitude by a small annuity, he at first eked out a scanty existence as best he could: and then begins his endless succession of *wanderyahre*—endless until broken by death—, while the drama carries one swiftly from Rotterdam to London, from London to Italy, from Italy to Switzerland, during which time the continuous composition of a sort of dilettante literature spreads broadcast his fame. Trimming sail to patrons and composing epistles in their honor, the sage nevertheless contrives to sweep onwards in *intellectual* liberty, owning dependence in the physical that he may dominate the spiritual, free of responsible position that he may speak his soul to humanity—"In Praise of Folly" lectures kings and prelates as no other living force could ever have dared. More at home in the world of books than of men; brooding upon illuminated manuscripts rather than upon Europe's scroll, penned with an iron stylus, and rubricated with gore; enamoured, in short, of the ideal rather than of earth-earthy (of which he would build his starry realm of tranquility)—with this outlook, Erasmus was scarcely a match for that Dantonesque dominican, Martin Luther, whose revolutionary sledge hammer would shatter those aery palaces forever. And destiny, with mocking irony, matched him against this titanic antagonist: the remainder of the drama depicts the combat between these two, typifying magnificently that eternal Armageddon of the flesh and the spirit, while Aeschylean choruses are performed by Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael, Michelangelo, Zwingli, Huss, Knox, Paracelsus, Magellan, Diaz, Charles V, Henry VIII, Francis I, Calvin.

As this cyclopean castastrophe proceeds, let us scan more closely the features of our Humanist champion: at Stefan Zweig's deft stroke, they stand out as never before. Pale, languid, listless, those features nevertheless convey strikingly the lineaments of the passionate soul within: eyes ablaze with energy under their almost oblique lids—long, pointed, prying nose, from whose inquisitive questionings little could long remain hid—a skin approaching the Chinese, and aureating patience—and a mouth so mocking that it would set to shame Mockery itself: by such trifles the outer man betrayed the inner man: and by them we may know him. Epicurean by nature, delicate to the point of anemia physically, minus the strength to masticate his enemies alive (like Luther), he appears equivocation personified: veiling himself in a nebulous cloud when brought to bay, spiritually darting like a rabbit into its burrow to remain until danger is past, he preserves an undoubted mental freedom at the inevitable expense of personal honor. Always lighting up problems, never solving them, he foreshadows at once Voltaire, Diderot, and their ilk, as well as the quicksilver *Zeit-Geist* of our modern age, content to skim matters and not to plumb them, yet inculcating by every act a multitude to achieve this task. In fine, Zweig's spectacle is a highly pictorial dramatization of a very great man and his epoch; and its implications, it may be said in passing, cut deeply indeed into the heart of present day affairs.

We beg pardon of the reader for so much philosophy all at once: and, as we see Erasmus enter upon his fatal schismatic war with Luther, bestial, bombastic, irresistible as that facet of truth which he represents; and in which spirit did indeed fall before the avenging arm of flesh, let us bid our Renaissance sage affectionate farewell, symbolizing as he does Europe's most hidden inward spiritual longings: "bold and timid, pushing and irresolute, mentally combative, free living where the heart was concerned, vain as a man of letters and yet humble and outside that sphere, a sceptic and an idealist", with ". . . his ant-like diligence, his free-thinking theology . . . his sardonic humor, his tender apostleship of all that is human." And, while passing over in merciful silence his downfall before the barbarous Luther (due to an insufficient contact with earth-earthy and its barbarian ways), let us never forget that his spirit is still at work amidst the tumult and turmoil of *our* Renaissance, uniting the seemingly unreconcilable, stirring men to labor endlessly towards that age of world brotherhood forever uppermost in his dreams "where Love, stronger than Death, shall make all things plain," strong in their master's assurance that they shall at last attain it, in the name of Him who prizes peace above predacity, and whose arm is not shortened.

ROBERT C. SCHALLER.

"Erasmus of Rotterdam," by Stefan Zweig. Published by the Viking Press. 1934. $3.00.

Correspondence

Important

To the Editor:

I would like to encourage the readers of your journal who are religious leaders to send in the Social Action Questionnaire mailed to them recently by the National Religion and Labor Foundation. The Foundation is eager to be able to make an authoritative statement about what ministers and rabbis are doing in the way of definite action for social justice. The point should be stressed again that the Foundation does not expect agreement on the numerous issues raised. It welcomes all points of view, for they are needed to form a true picture of the situation.

WILLARD E. UPHAUS,
Executive Secretary,
National Religion and Labor Foundation,
304 Crown St.,
New Haven, Conn.

Quick, Beneficial Returns

Editor of UNITY:

An increase in the amount paid in old age assistance would bring quick, beneficial returns, resulting in moving over the counters an appreciable volume of the necessaries of life, thus permeating lines of trade that would stimulate employment. It is suggested that this priming of the pump would not be handicapped by the long-time element which precludes rapid returns on almost all the ventures so far instituted by the government, and which, aside from the important features of employing men and capital, only tends to inflate land values perceptibly, thus making it harder for small business undertakings to get under way.

The proposal by the American Federation of Labor is the most practical one. If the aged received what might be called, for them, "a living wage," the marks of penury, the unseasonable, shabby clothing, the broken footwear would disappear very soon.

When the present age set for assistance has arrived ailments, more or less serious, are present caused by hardships inherent in an unjust social system. The allowance is not sufficient to purchase the indicated remedies or palliatives. Unless proper food, clothing and remedies are soon put within their reach an added cost of hospitalization will outweigh the agitated stipend. In Massachusetts no single room with heat and light can be had for less than $3. This leaves the recipient with $3 for food, clothing, medicine and the seat in church.

Many of them are parents or grandparents who reared families under stress of personal privations to themselves and are now deprived of the cherishing care that might have been theirs but for the Great Blunder! The ashes of beloved youth consecrates the soil of a foreign land; many who returned are immured in hospitals, sans light, sans intellect! In their present helplessness and loneliness shall we not make them a friendly gesture on the way out!

WINIFRED B. COSSETTE.
Cambridge, Mass.

Capital Punishment

Editor of UNITY:

As one of the many who grieved for and sympathized with Mr. and Mrs. Charles A. Lindbergh in their great bereavement when their little son was taken from them I venture to write the public a few thoughts through the columns of your valued paper.

Unquestionably many people believe that the perpetrator of that indescribably heinous deed has been brought to the bar and will pay with the prescribed penalty of death in the electric chair.

Nevertheless I cannot believe that the injured principals are happy about this. I believe they have suffered too deeply to be able to think with any degree of satisfaction of the feelings of a wife and mother who will endure the same torture they endured if and when the one she loves shall be taken from her by "the due process of law."

I am not pleading for a single life though I cannot believe that so-called circumstantial evidence, no matter how convincing it may be made to appear is sufficient upon which to declare a person guilty of murder. I am protesting the whole system that authorizes society to do so futile a thing as to take a life in the guise of punishment. Two wrongs do not make a right! Legalized State murder is even less excusable than murder done by a person of perhaps questionable mental balance. I am pleading for the abolition of this system and the substitution of a system that shall treat misnamed criminals as mentally sick persons. Also I am pleading for a system that shall be so equitable that every child shall have the advantages that the Lindberghs hoped to bestow upon their little son. Admittedly environment and habits such as the brutal habits engendered in youth when forced into murderous wars and society incidentally are responsible for many of the deeds we call crimes.

It seems to me that people highly esteemed and of great social influence would be privileged to build no better monument to a beloved memory than to dedicate themselves to forwarding a social system in which there shall be no slum environments to breed psychopaths and no incentive to anti-social deeds; a system in which there shall be no more great fortunes made at the expense of little children and sweated factory labor producing warped mentalities; and above all a system in which there shall be no more legal murder such as capital punishment and war, but a system guaranteeing in very truth life and equal opportunity for all.

(MRS.) ANNIE E. GRAY.
Formerly Director The Women's Peace Society.
Kremmling, Colo.

The Gold Clause

Editor of UNITY:

The Supreme Court has rendered its decision in the Gold Clause Cases, but the mess we are in, still remains.

The cases have at least proven the terrible curse a nation brings upon itself when its government legislates a certain value into *gold,* or any other commodity, for the purpose of creating money to serve as a medium of exchange.

Entering into contracts for the future payment of money in *gold* constitutes *short selling* in its worst form.

During the war our government was inveigled into the execution of contracts (bonds) to deliver fifty billion dollars (viz.: 25½ billion in bonds and 24½ billion in interest thereof) in *gold* within a period of thirty years.

When these bonds were issued, there was only

three billion dollars of gold in the U. S. and less than seven billion dollars in the world.

The average annual production of gold was then and is now, less than fifty million dollars in the U. S. and less than 385 million dollars in the world.

Assuming that the world production would continue at this rate during this 30 year period, there would then (at $20.67 an ounce) be only 19 billion dollars worth of gold in the world with which to fulfil, not only our fifty billion dollars in contracts, but also hundreds of billions of dollars in other similar contracts throughout the world.

Can you imagine a civilization so stupid as to enter into the wholesale execution of contracts to deliver *in gold* at least twenty or more times the total amount of gold available in the whole world?

We might well exclaim, *"What fools we mortals be."*

S. O. Sanderson.

Rochester, Minn.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 22)

liberty is not yet a 'decaying stinking corpse" (Mussolini's expression). There is no danger of Fascism in any of those countries, but unfortunately, as I go on my vacation in the winter, trying to escape New York's January, February and March, I could not go to those countries because the winter there is even worse than it is in New York.

And then again, coming back to central Europe, economic conditions there are worse than in the U. S. The poverty and the mendicancy are heart-breaking, while the prices of everything are relatively higher than they are in the U. S.

In short, from every point of view the U. S. is a paradise compared with the hell of Europe. And as to the climate, we have in Florida and in Southern California places with which no part of Europe can compare. And so, taking everything into consideration, I shall stick to the U. S. A.

Oh, yes, the U. S. S. R. I was intending to pay it another visit, hoping on my return to be able to write a more hopeful, more complimentary book about the Bolshevist regime. But the recent mass exetions without trial, without investigation, have taken away all my desire to visit that country again. I was hoping that it was becoming liberalized and I was rejoicing over the fact. But, alas, it seems that a dictatorship, whether Fascist, Nazist or *so-called* Proletarian, is a damnable curse, a black plague.—Dr. *William J. Robinson,* in *Critic and Guide.*

Plan to Enslave India

In the old-fashioned rope trick, the Indian climbed up the rope and disappeared. The new trick is the invention of the Joint Select Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform. The idea is that the Indian has to climb our rope and hang himself from it.

Few of India's 350 million people will read the report of this Committee, and fewer still will understand it. Such reports are not written to be read by the "man in the street" either in India or England, still less to be understood. The following facts, however, are concealed in over 400 pages of dreary verbiage.

1. Franchise is to be restricted to 14 per cent of the population in the Provinces, leaving 86 per cent of the people (i. e., about half the adult population) entirely unrepresented.

The distribution of seats and votes is provided for by a highly involved and intricate system that gives enormous weightage to "property" interests. A few seats in each Province are allocated for the "representation" of Labor, but while the qualifications of property, service in the army, etc., are specified, we read with regard to Labor that "the question of the franchise for these constituencies is under consideration."

2. In the Federal Legislature, which is to be the All-India "Parliament," the franchise will be even more restricted. One-third of the seats will be occupied by representatives of the Indian Princes—Feudal autocrats who are the puppets of British Imperialism.

3. Both the Provincial and the Federal "Parliaments" will have "Second Chambers." In the Provinces the report states that "the franchise (for these Upper Houses) will be based on high property qualifications, or a qualification based on service in certain distinguished public offices." In the Federal Legislature the Upper House will have 104 representatives of the Indian Princes, out of a total of 260! There will also be Government nominees, and (needless to say) Europeans in India will be represented out of all proportion to their numbers.

4. In case such "Parliaments" should prove too radical, the Viceroy and Provincial Governors will be appointed by H. M. Government at Whitehall, to which they will remain responsible.

The powers of the Viceroy and Governors will include:

Complete control of the Army and of Foreign Relations.

Complete control of whatever proportion of the budget may be required for these and other dictatorial purposes, also for the Church.

"Special Powers" to use in certain emergencies (of which these autocrats will themselves be the judges), including the right to make "Governor's Acts" (i. e., to pass laws by decree which the "Parliaments" have refused to pass) or to issue ordinances having all the force of the law.

In short, they can be dictators whenever it suits them.

The Report makes it quite clear that these last provisions are primarily intended to "safeguard" the ill-gotten wealth and privileges of British Capitalists. The rest of the Constitution is itself the best safeguard of Indian Capitalists.

The Report is an olive branch offered by British Capitalism to Indian Capitalism, now that both are faced by a common foe; the workers of both countries.

In face of such a charter of reaction, the memorandum of Major Attlee makes pitiful reading—not that one would expect otherwise from a Signatory of the infamous Simon Report.

The representative of the Labor Party passes over in silence the basic Imperialism of the whole scheme, and is discreetly silent regarding British financial interests. In his alternative "plan," he assumes British Viceroy's and Governor's General controlling "reserved subjects, such as Defense," and exercising "special powers."

The co-operation of the Labor Party on the Joint Select Com-

mittee is proof that the Labor Party Chiefs are just as willing today to plant a "Made in England" Constitution in India as they were in two "Labor" Governments to carry on the Imperialist system, with all its robbery and butchery. They are lackeys of Imperialism.

There is only one policy for British Socialists in relation to Indians, Africans, and all other subject peoples—that is, to get off their backs.

Socialism is the one thing that we could wish to "give" them, and Socialism is the one thing that we cannot "give" them—it means the revolt of the masses and the establishment of a workers' democracy: things that no foreign conqueror can give, but can only retard.

The task of the I. L. P. with regard to India is to work for four things:

1. The withdrawal of British troops and the sabotage of all military preparations by dock strikes, etc.

2. Repudiation of all British capitalist "interest" in India—mines, factories, banks, plantations, "National Debt," etc. Also pensions of civil and military ex-officials.

3. Recognition of India's right to complete independence outside the so-called "British Commonwealth of Nations."

4. International solidarity with Indian peasants and workers in their struggles for bread, Trade Union Rights, release of political prisoners, free speech and right of assembly, freedom of the press, etc.

National independence for India is not the end but the beginning—the first condition of that social freedom and racial equality on which the Socialist International must be built.

—*Reginald Reynolds.*

—*The New Leader* (London).

35,000 Dead,—And the Driver Who Drinks!

The National Safety Council in a preliminary review of 1934's record states that motor traffic accident deaths for 1934 reached a total of 35,500—at least 5,500 more than in 1933.

A similar national survey connected with the Travelers Insurance Company of Hartford, Conn., reports a gain, as compared with 1933, of nearly 24% in the number of drunken drivers and of more than 55% in drunken pedestrians involved in automobile accidents in 1934.

A survey presented, by Dr. Theron Wendell Kilmer of New York City, reports many individual city police records showing startling increases in accidents attributable to intoxication, among them: New York City, 25%; Philadelphia, 300%; District of Columbia, 42%; Cincinnati, 380%; Los Angeles, 479%; New Orleans, 122%.

Reckoned on the basis of the National Safety Council's statistical findings, which in an official statement last year asserted that each automobile accident fatality involved a property loss of $50,000, the record of automobile deaths in 1934 involved a total cost to the participants of $1,772,000,000,—an increase of something like $275,000,000 over that of 1933!

This is simply one item in the record of re-legalized liquor's first year since repeal. Dry laws, backed by public sentiment educated and aroused by this record, and abolishing liquor advertising, would go far toward remedying this startling situation.—*The Signal Press, Evanston, Ill.*

Unity-Forward March

A SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN

For a period of six months, from January 1 to July 1, 1935, UNITY will accept renewals, extensions, and new subscriptions at $2.00 for one year.

UNITY is an excellent gift for friends, students, libraries, etc.

Special feature stories of MEN YOU OUGHT TO KNOW will begin in an early issue.

To Unity Publishing Company, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen: Enclosed you will find check for $2.00 for which please enter / renew / extend my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Name .....

Address .....

Subscribe to

The New Humanist

Published six times a year.

Raymond B. Bragg, Editor
Edwin H. Wilson, Managing Editor

In the February-March Issue

LLEWELLYN JONES
H. G. Wells: An Articulate Bourgeois

ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION
Maurice Visscher

THE CHALLENGE OF WORKERS EDUCATION
Lucien Koch

ARCHITECTURAL BANDWAGON
Paul Schweikher

REVOLUTION IS UPON US
Clarence R. Decker

HUMANISM IN ENGLAND
Edwin H. Wilson

MYSTIC NATURALISM
E. Burdette Backus

NO MORE POVERTY
Roland R. Renne

"There is valuable material in this journal which I do not find elsewhere."
—*John Dewey.*

Per Copy 25c **Annually, $1.50**

THE HUMANIST PRESS ASSOCIATION

330 South Dearborn Street, Chicago